DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 044 PS 021 440

AUTHOR Kagan, Sharon L.; And Others
TITLE Family Education and Training: From Research to Practice. Implementation Plan. Report No. 14.
INSTITUTION Center on Families Communities, Schools and Children's Learning.; Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn. Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Feb 93
CONTRACT R117Q00031
NOTE 48p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Development; Adult Learning; Adult Vocational Education; Career Development; *Child Care Occupations; Employment Programs; Federal Programs; *Job Training; Literature Reviews; *Low Income Groups; *Mothers; *Parent Education; Parenting Skills; Program Descriptions; Research and Development; *Theory Practice Relationship; Welfare Services

ABSTRACT

This report provides an overview of the second year of the Family Education and Training Program, a project constructed to: (1) investigate the impact of a comprehensive child care training program on the employability of low-income mothers; and (2) assess the effect of training and support in parenting and job readiness on parenting skills and children's cognitive and social competence. During the first year of the project, a comprehensive literature review was conducted. During the second year, the idea behind the project was converted into a field program and research design. Based on findings from the literature review, an intervention was designed, an implementation plan was developed, and a site was selected. Section I of the report introduces the project, following which section II presents key findings from the Year I literature review. In sections III, IV, and V, the report reviews existing child care training, parenting, and job readiness curricula, with the goal of laying the foundation of the curriculum to be used in the project. Section VI surveys the experiences of current and recently operating child care training programs, culling field-based lessons on program structure, population, staffing, support services, and outcomes. Section VII recounts advancements made in locating an appropriate home for the program and developing a research design for evaluating the program. Finally, section VIII explicitly describes the structure and content of the program's proposed intervention, detailing its framework, schedule, and staffing patterns. Four appendices present reference lists of child care training curricula and projects, parenting curricula, and job readiness curricula. (Contains 46 references.) (Author/AC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED360044

CENTER ON FAMILIES, COMMUNITIES, SCHOOLS & CHILDREN'S LEARNING

FAMILY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

FROM RESEARCH TO PRACTICE

Implementation Plan

Sharon L. Kagan

Peter Neville

Jean Rustici

Report No. 14 / February 1993

PS 021 449

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CENTER ON FAMILIES, COMMUNITIES, SCHOOLS & CHILDREN'S LEARNING

Consortium Partners

Boston University, School of Education,
Institute for Responsive Education,
605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215 (617) 353-3309 fax: (617) 353-8444
The Johns Hopkins University,
3505 North Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21218 (410) 516-0370 fax: (410) 516-6370
The University of Illinois, 210 Education Building,
1310 S. Sixth Street, Champaign, IL 61820 (217) 333-2245 fax: (217) 333-5847
Wheelock College,
45 Pilgrim Road, Boston, MA 02215 (617) 734-5200 fax: (617) 566-7369
Yale University,
310 Prospect Street, New Haven, CT 06520 (203) 432-9931 fax: (203) 432-9933

For more information on the work of the Center, contact:
Owen Heleen, Dissemination Director,
Institute for Responsive Education,
605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215 (617) 353-3309 fax: (617) 353-8444

National Advisory Panel

Robert Bartman (Chair), Commissioner of Education, Missouri Department of Education, Jefferson City MO
Barbara Bowman, Erikson Institute, Chicago IL
James Comer, Maurice Falk Professor of Child Psychiatry, Yale Child Study Center, New Haven CT
Gayle Dorman, Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis IN
Sanford M. Dornbusch, Director, Family Study Center, Stanford University, Stanford CA
Susan Freedman, Director, Office of Community Education, Massachusetts Department of Education, Quincy MA
Frieda Garcia, Executive Director, United South End Settlements, Boston MA
Maria Garza-Lubeck, Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington DC
Evelyn K. Moore, Executive Director, National Black Child Development Institute, Washington DC
Douglas R. Powell, Child Development and Family Studies, Purdue University, West Lafayette IN
Jonathan Sher, Director, North Carolina REAL Enterprises, Chapel Hill NC
Nora Toney, Teacher, David A. Ellis School, Roxbury MA
Rafael Valdivieso, Vice President and Director, School and Community Services, Academy for Educational Development, Washington DC
Robert Witherspoon, Education Consultant, RaSaun & Associates, Inc., Herndon VA

FAMILY EDUCATION AND TRAINING: FROM RESEARCH TO PRACTICE

Implementation Plan

Sharon L. Kagan

Peter Neville

Jean Rustici

The Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy
Yale University

Report No. 14

February 1993

Published by the Center on Families, Communities, Schools, and Children's Learning. The Center is supported by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education (R117Q 00031) in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The opinions expressed are the authors' own and do not represent OERI or HHS positions or policies.

CENTER ON FAMILIES, COMMUNITIES, SCHOOLS & CHILDREN'S LEARNING

The nation's schools must do more to improve the education of all children, but schools cannot do this alone. More will be accomplished if families and communities work with children, with each other, and with schools to promote successful students.

The mission of this Center is to conduct research, evaluations, policy analyses, and dissemination to produce new and useful knowledge about how families, schools, and communities influence student motivation, learning, and development. A second important goal is to improve the connections between and among these major social institutions.

Two research programs guide the Center's work: the Program on the Early Years of Childhood, covering children aged 0-10 through the elementary grades; and the Program on the Years of Early and Late Adolescence, covering youngsters aged 11-19 through the middle and high school grades.

Research on family, school, and community connections must be conducted to understand more about all children and all families, not just those who are economically and educationally advantaged or already connected to school and community resources. The Center's projects pay particular attention to the diversity of family cultures and backgrounds and to the diversity in family, school, and community practices that support families in helping children succeed across the years of childhood and adolescence. Projects also examine policies at the federal, state, and local levels that produce effective partnerships.

A third program of Institutional Activities includes a wide range of dissemination projects to extend the Center's national leadership. The Center's work will yield new information, practices, and policies to promote partnerships among families, communities, and schools to benefit children's learning.

Abstract

This document summarizes the work of Year II of the Family Education and Training Program: the process involved in converting an idea into a field program and research design. Following a review of the key findings from the literature (from Year I), the document explicates a review of existing child care training, parenting, and job readiness curricula (in Sections III, IV, and V, respectively), with the goal of laying the foundation of the curriculum to be used in the project. Section VI surveys the experiences of current and recently operating child care training programs, culling field-based lessons on program structure, population, staffing, support services, and outcomes. Section VII recounts advancements made in locating an appropriate home and developing a research design for evaluating the program. Finally, Section VIII explicitly describes the structure and content of the proposed intervention, detailing the intervention's framework, schedule, and staffing patterns.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. SUMMARY OF THE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 3

III. TRAINING CURRICULA REVIEW 9

IV. PARENTING CURRICULA REVIEW 12

V. JOB READINESS CURRICULA REVIEW 15

VI. SURVEY OF CHILD CARE TRAINING PROGRAMS 17

VII. ORGANIZATIONAL HOME AND RESEARCH DESIGN 23

VIII. OUTLINE OF THE PROPOSED INTERVENTION 24

REFERENCES 32

APPENDIX A - CHILD CARE TRAINING CURRICULA 36

APPENDIX B - PARENTING CURRICULA 38

APPENDIX C - JOB READINESS CURRICULA 40

APPENDIX D - CHILD CARE TRAINING PROJECTS 41

I. INTRODUCTION

Background and Rationale of the Project

Predicated on data that attest to the efficacy of early intervention and increasing female employment rates, federal and state legislatures have dramatically increased their commitments to child care and early education programs. Such program expansion has created a need for well-trained child care staff, an employment pool already characterized by short supply and high turnover rates (41%). Responding to these factors, leaders in the early care and education profession have begun to reassess the field's training capacity. Simultaneously, social planners have suggested that low-income mothers whose children may be enrolled in the new programs as a result of welfare reform legislation (Family Support Act) might be a suitable pool of potential trainees for child care and early education positions, thereby increasing their employability and their knowledge of child development.

To that end, the Family Education and Training Project has been constructed: 1) to investigate the impact of a comprehensive child care training program on the employability of low-income women who are parents; and 2) to assess the impact that such training, incorporating a focus on parenting education and support as well as job readiness preparation, has on their skills in parenting their own children and on their children's cognitive and social competence. The project hypothesizes that such high-quality, comprehensive training, coupled with appropriate supports, can have economic, social, and educational benefits for low-income women and their children, and can help fill a growing employment gap in the supply of well-qualified child care personnel.

Although child care training for low-income women has received some limited attention in the past, the Family Education and Training Program is different from its predecessors in the following ways. First, the intervention has multiple goals: it is intended to help participants become effective child care providers *and* more knowledgeable and skilled parents. Second, the focus is holistic; it is not limited to an individual adult, but is directed to altering life circumstances for children and families. Third, rather than envisioning child care training as the ultimate and sole end-goal, this effort recognizes that child care employment may be an entry into the world of work, thereby serving as an effective transition for families.

Such an orientation suggests the use of new combinations of strategies, including a focus on supports for both adults and children, a relatively long-duration intervention leading to an established credential (Child Development Associate), a program responsive to individual needs and cultural backgrounds, and a focus on trainee empowerment rather than didactic pedagogy. Moreover, such an orientation demands that the curriculum be individualized, yet sufficiently comprehensive to address three distinct training domains: (1) child care training; (2) parenting education; and (3) job readiness.

In the past two years, researchers at the Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning have examined the viability and planned the implementation of such an intervention. In Year I -- November, 1990 to October, 1991 -- a comprehensive review was conducted of the literature on adult learning, female employability, the history of efforts to train low-income women, child care training programs, parent education, and the child care market (Kagan et al., 1992). In Year II -- November, 1991 to October, 1992 -- based on findings from both the review of the literature and Year II efforts, the intervention was designed, an implementation plan developed, and a site selected. It is anticipated that the intervention will be piloted in Year III -- November, 1992 to October, 1993 -- and that formal data collection will begin with the training of Cohort I in Year IV -- November, 1993 to October, 1994 -- and carry through Cohort II in Year V -- November, 1994 to October, 1995.

Purpose of this Document

The purpose of this document is to summarize the work of Year II: the process involved in converting an idea into a field program and research design. Following a review of the key findings from the literature (from Year I) in the next section (Section II), the document explicates a review of existing child care training, parenting, and job readiness curricula (in Sections III, IV, and V, respectively), with the goal of laying the foundation of the curriculum to be used in the project. Section VI surveys the experiences of current and recently operating child care training programs, culling field-based lessons on program structure, population, staffing, support services, and outcomes. Section VII recounts advancements made in locating an appropriate home and developing a research design for evaluating the program. Finally, Section VIII explicitly describes the structure and content of the proposed intervention, detailing the intervention's framework, schedule, and staffing patterns.

II. SUMMARY OF THE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE (YEAR I)

The training of low-income women has been a subject of much controversy for the past 100 years. Widely debated in the women's, labor, education, and training literatures, training low-income women for child care employment (either home or center-based) has been attempted less frequently. Laden more with ideology than empiricism, quality research is sparse, though not non-existent. Several demonstration efforts launched in conjunction with federal legislation (WIN, CETA, JTPA, FSA) or under the aegis of public/private partnerships (New Chance, Minority Female Single Parent Demonstration) provide insights into the opportunities and obstacles associated with training low-income women in general. And, though considerably fewer, some studies address training low-income women for child care employment in particular (Fresh Start, Child Welfare League of America, CAPE). Moreover, relevant information is available in the youth employment, vocational education, community development, adult learning and development, literacy, and parenting education literatures. Such analyses have examined complex questions related to the definition of low-income women (Besharov, 1989; Ellwood, 1988), training as a cause and effect of gender inequity (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1979; U.S. GAO, 1989a, 1989b), and the general viability of welfare-to-work programs (Gueron, 1989; Maxfield, 1990).

The specific purpose of the year I review of the literature was to answer the question: How can we most effectively train low-income women for positions in family or center-based child care, given what we know about: a) low-income women, their development and learning; b) the effects of federal policies on female employability; c) the effects of specific child care training and parenting programs for this population; and d) the current early care and education market, industry, and profession in our nation?

To examine this question, the analysis examined five inter-related topics: (1) the participant body, discerning what we know about sub-groups of low-income women, their development and learning; (2) the major federal employment and training efforts, emphasizing relevant lessons, barriers, and benefits; (3) specific child care training, parenting, literacy, two-generational, and vocational and community education programs, with the goal of shedding light on curricular and instructional modalities and their effects; (4) the state of the child care industry, examining

caregiver supply, career ladders, financial incentives, and potential revenue streams that might be available to partially support subsequent phases of the project, and (5) the implications of the literature review for this project. The findings from each section are summarized below.

The Participant Body

The definition of *low-income*, and the distinctions among the various subgroups of the low-income population, have been the focus of considerable discussion and controversy in the literature. Though low-income is commonly defined as living in a household or family with a yearly income below the poverty line, the determination of the poverty line has been criticized for its failure to account for such variables as regional variation (Ellwood, 1988) and the recent increase in the cost of housing relative to other family costs (Duncan, 1984).

Within the category of low-income are two major subgroups: (1) welfare recipients (including AFDC, Food Stamps, and/or Medicaid); and (2) the working poor (who do not qualify for welfare although their income level falls below the poverty line). Ellwood (1988) points out that poor single-parent families (female headed) are more likely to qualify for welfare than poor two-parent families, who tend to be among the working poor. He further notes that although single-parent families on welfare may receive more supports and be better off than the working poor, these supports can place recipients in what has been termed the "poverty trap," in which attempts to leave welfare through employment are met with immediate reductions in benefits.

Demographic research indicates that 59 percent of women on welfare first gave birth as a teenager, that the majority have 1 or 2 children, and that 65% of AFDC mothers have an education level of at least a high school diploma or GED (Zill, Moore, Nord, & Stief, 1991). In addition, studies have suggested that there is a certain amount of mobility in and out of poverty (Bane & Ellwood, 1986; Duncan, 1984), though the extent of the mobility is unclear due to a lack of agreement on methodological and definitional issues. Still, demographic differences between long-term and short-term welfare recipients and poor have been discovered. Female-headed families are much more likely to be persistently poor and welfare-dependent (Duncan, 1984), and for never-married mothers, this effect is even more pronounced (Besharov, 1989; Ellwood, 1986). Nonwhites have spells that are about twice as long

as whites (Ruggles, 1988, 1989), and longer poverty spells/welfare recipiency are also associated with lower education levels (Besharov, 1989; Bane & Ellwood, 1983; O'Neill, Wolf, Bassi, & Hannan, 1984; Zill et al., 1991), previous welfare receipt (Grossman, Maynard, & Roberts, 1985), teen motherhood (Ooms & Owen, 1991; Zill et al., 1991), and greater number of children (Zill et al., 1991).

Though not focused on issues of low-income individuals in particular, the literatures on adult development and learning provide further insight into more general aspects of the participant body. For example, the adult development literature considers the existence of distinct stages of development (stage theory), the categorization of individuals as they develop (differential theory), and their possible linkage to age and biological development, external events and crises, and internal aggregations of experience.

In addition, there is evidence of unique developmental issues and characteristics specifically concerning women. First, warnings have been issued by some researchers concerning the inappropriateness of many developmental models to explain the experience of women, citing their inability to consider a stronger relationship orientation for women (Gilligan, 1982), differences between genders in coping styles at various life stages (Lowenthal, Thurnher, & Chiriboga, 1975), and a unique set of developmental stages for women based on their social roles and life goals (e.g., integrating the conflicting responsibilities of family and career) (Sheehy, 1976).

Second, the development of adolescent mothers has been found to be somewhat different from that of other adolescent girls. Motherhood compresses in time the already complicated tasks of adolescent development and self-definition, and the ability of teen mothers to make the successful transition to adulthood is often predicated on the availability of support from family, peers, schools, and other social institutions. Given the fact that the slight majority of low-income women first gave birth as teenagers (Zill, et al., 1991), this knowledge is particularly critical to the construction of the proposed intervention.

Linked closely to adult *development* theory, the adult *learning* literature provides insight into the motivation of adult learners and conditions regarding their receptivity to instruction. In contrast with children's learning, adult learning is usually motivated by a specific desire to solve a practical problem (Knowles, 1980; Zemke

& Zemke, 1981) or to learn an immediately-applicable skill (Knox, 1980), and in such cases it is most effective when directed and paced by the learner, rather than the teacher. Adult learners often need help in understanding the relevance of what they are learning (Cross, 1981), and this is often best done by relating the new information to past experience (Knowles, 1980). Research has also noted the effect of learning on personal development, citing the ability of education to instill feelings of empowerment (Freire, 1970), propel individuals into new courses of action (Mezirow, 1981), and reverse self-fulfilling prophecies (Lasker & Moore, 1980).

Federal Employment and Training Efforts

Federal job training efforts have been conducted under the aegis of three departments: Labor (employment and training), Education (vocational training), and Health and Human Services (welfare-related training). Tracing the evolution of federal job training policy reveals that, in contrast with today's programs, early efforts tended to focus on job creation and placement rather than skills training, on federal rather than local oversight, and on men rather than women. During the development and growth of federal involvement -- through the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) of 1962, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) of 1973, the Job Training and Partnership Act (JTPA) of 1983, and the 1988 Family Support Act (FSA) -- the government has gradually come to embrace some of the philosophies and strategies necessary to address the training and support needs of low-income women. However, real equity for women in training has not yet been reached. Research has found that under JTPA, women receive different training modalities than men and are trained for occupations with lower skill levels (U.S. GAO, 1989a), and that in fact the act's emphasis on performance standards may be a disincentive to train women, who often need additional supports. In addition, women with children under the age of five are underrepresented in much of the literature because, until the FSA, they were exempt from welfare-mandated training. Now that their participation is required, this population's unique training needs may make the generalization of many extant research findings inappropriate.

Given these caveats, some general relevant findings can be drawn from the literature. To begin with, though most evaluated employment and training programs have demonstrated some positive impacts on low-income women, these impacts have generally been insufficient to raise significant numbers of women out of poverty (Maxfield, 1990). Impacts have been strongest on those who have not completed

high school (Hollister, Kemper, & Maynard, 1984), or who in other ways are less likely to succeed on their own. For AFDC recipients, programs incorporating job training with supported work have been the most effective. Finally, measuring program benefits in terms of social impact and economic gains to participants (which is not often done) indicates that more expensive interventions, such as supported work, are the most effective (Maxfield, 1990).

Training and Parenting Programs

A review of specific training and parenting program types -- including nationwide general employment efforts, child care training, general parenting, and two-generation and literacy programs -- reveals a promising precedent for the proposed intervention, as well as concrete recommendations for the education and training of low-income women. Initial forays into the field of training low-income women for child care were made in the late 1960s and early 1970s under the Child Welfare League of America (two programs) and the U.S. Department of Labor's Women's Bureau (Fresh Start). These programs, though varying in their levels of success, established the much-discussed topic as a viable field for further development.

Though extensive, the training and parenting literature reveals certain commonalities, both within the field and with other sections of the literature review. Echoing the adult learning literature, a strong trend in the literature on these programs was the focus on linking training to practical issues in participants' lives -- often through the use of concurrent hands-on practice -- and the efficacy of self-paced, competency-based training to meet participants' individualized needs and learning styles. The profound barriers to self-sufficiency faced by low-income women were cited throughout the literature to stress the need to include comprehensive support services (child care, transportation, counseling) in training programs. Programs dating back to the CWLA efforts have noted the value of having specific guidelines to train program instructors (to minimize instructors' individual interpretations of the intervention). The growing trend to incorporate children and parents together in a learning setting has recognized potent secondary benefits arising from the interaction between children and parents. Finally, though the roles of parent and child care provider are in many ways similar, a comparison of the two reveals certain differences in the responsibilities of these roles, and indicates that no single training modality could adequately address both.

The State of the Child Care Industry

Literature on the economic forces affecting the child care industry predicts a continued increase in demand for center-based child care. This increase is expected to be especially strong in infant and toddler centers, given the earlier return of mothers to the work force following child birth. Expansion of the market, however, will not necessarily be accompanied by improved conditions for employees. Despite the promise of expanding employment opportunities, research suggests that there will be no substantial increase in wages. Wages have not increased in real terms over the past twenty years of market expansion and increased government subsidy (Kisker, Hofferth, & Phillips, 1991), and unless the market becomes less elastic (i.e., the worker supply becomes less responsive to small changes in wages), wages are likely to remain low (Blau, 1989). Also, the existence of career ladders and other tools for career advancement within the field remain limited, although research linking provider training with quality of care (Ruopp, Travers, Glantz, & Coelen, 1979) and criticizing the present system of provider training (Bredekamp, 1990; Copple, 1990; Costley, 1988; Howes, 1990; Peters, 1988; Rockefeller Brothers Fund, 1990) is motivating organizations (Wheelock Center for Career Development in Early Care and Education, Child Care Employee Project, NAEYC) to explore methods of establishing a widespread and comprehensive system of career advancement.

Programs that train low-income women for employment in child care may tap into a wide range of potential funding sources. Promising sources include the CDA Scholarship program, Head Start, the JOBS program, FSA Title IV-A (Child Care Licensing/Monitoring Improvement Grants), Title XX (Social Services Block Grant), Child Care and Development Block Grant, JTPA (Titles II-A and III), and Pell Grants, though few of these sources mandate dollars specifically for this purpose.

Implications for the Project

Though not exhaustive within each of the disciplines addressed, the literature review provides an overall view of the critical issues that the training/parenting intervention will face. Particularly striking is the agreement of findings across disciplines. The literatures both on personal development and on the efficacy of training interventions support the proactive role of adults in their own learning, the need for support services, and the need for training to have immediate, practical relevance to participants' lives.

The findings of the review suggest some concrete recommendations for the design and implementation of the training/parenting intervention, summarized by the following guidelines:

(1) Participation should be voluntary.

(2) The intervention should be comprehensive to meet participants' needs for support services.

(3) The intervention should be individualized to accommodate varied learning rates and styles, to meet participants' needs as adult learners, and to respect their cultural backgrounds. A sense of independence should be fostered through a balance of structured support and personal responsibility.

(4) The curriculum should relate closely to real-world issues, include practical experience, and provide guidelines for training the instructors.

(5) The intervention should be viewed not simply as a job training program, but as a route to self-sufficiency, improved family conditions, and a more positive sense of well-being for parents and children alike.

III. TRAINING CURRICULA REVIEW (YEAR II)

Following the completion of the literature review, we began to explore existing curricula that might be suitable for the child care training component of the intervention. We selected 22 curricula in use within the last decade (see Appendix A), and building on the findings in Year I, we identified essential criteria that would enable us to compare systematically the curricula on variables most germane to the training of low-income women. We selected the following criteria: entry gate; curriculum content; program duration; teaching strategies; and training of trainers.

Findings

Our review of the 22 training curricula yielded the following findings.

Entry Gate. A majority of the training curricula reviewed require literacy and are directed toward participants 18 and older who possess a high school diploma or GED. There are practical reasons for these parameters. The age level is based on the fact that in most states, 18 is the legal age of adulthood, which is required in

order to function as a staff member in a child care setting. A high school diploma or GED is required for child care employment above the level of basic assistant in the majority of states. Further, though not a guarantee of literacy, the possession of a diploma or GED indicates a greater likelihood of literacy, which is necessary in order to communicate effectively with young children, and to read and write with them. Moreover, literacy is necessary in order to provide a literate environment that fosters the development of children's skills.

Content. Most curricula reviewed are based on sound child development principles and include descriptions of what children are like at various ages and stages. Although the basic information presented is theoretically solid, there is generally limited effort expended to link this information with the teacher's practical responsibilities. Specifically, there is limited explicit attention to applying basic developmental knowledge to child pedagogy or classroom structure.

Some curricula reviewed, however, reflect a different structuring of material to address the attainment of competencies. In these cases, the content presented strengthens the link between knowledge and performance. Although based on somewhat different philosophical approaches, some curricula have utilized the competency structure implemented by the Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition. Known as the Child Development Associate (CDA) competencies, this structure links a knowledge base with functional performance in child care settings. The curricula that utilize this structure more fully encompass the three traditional components of early childhood teacher preparation: (1) foundations that provide a knowledge base for performance; (2) methods of teaching that provide necessary skills and behavior; and (3) practical experience that integrates knowledge and skills.

Duration. The duration of time required for a majority of the curricula is one academic year, although some are as brief as six weeks. The curricula that are organized for the shortest duration address the development of specific skills, without providing the context of a theoretical knowledge base.

Teaching Strategies. Although all curricula include segments of direct instruction, most suggest the use of a variety of teaching strategies, including shared decision making between trainers and trainees. Some curricula present the possibility of individualizing instruction through the use of a mentor or advisor model, pairing trainee and instructor. Several programs using this strategy allow self-paced, self-

study formats for adults presently working in child care programs. In addition to accommodating individual learning styles, these strategies provide the opportunity to support cultural variation, although few curricula actually contain specific guidelines.

Training of Trainers. Our findings indicate general weaknesses in most of the curricula that purport to train trainers. Generally speaking, few curricula integrate the content for trainees with the training of trainers; that is, they do not provide guidance to the trainers to help them clarify specific content elements for the trainees. Instead, they present trainers with didactic instructions that concentrate on the skills needed to manage the program, including establishing the setting, obtaining the materials, and keeping the group on task. Among all curricula reviewed, only three were identified that have an acceptably synchronized system in place -- one in which the content of materials for training the trainers parallel the content of trainee materials.

Recommendations

Based on the review of training curricula and our Year I findings, our process has identified the *Essentials* curriculum, developed by The Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition (Phillips, 1991), as the curriculum that best meets the requirements of the proposed intervention, including both the above criteria and other practical considerations related to the project's goals, for the following reasons:

(1) It designates an entry gate of age 18 and a high school diploma or GED. Although such an education requirement excises from the program an especially needy segment of the low-income population, it ensures that trainees will have the educational qualifications necessary to obtain employment above the entry level. Further, the literature indicates that more than half of women on AFDC, and about half of those women classified by the Family Support Act as long-term recipients still qualify (Zill et al., 1991);

(2) The curriculum provides a base of theoretical knowledge as well as concrete guidance and information for the role the trainee will assume as a child care worker, and it promotes the coordination of knowledge and implementation through practical experience;

(3) The curriculum design allows for flexible timing of curriculum content sections, so that it may be comfortably adapted for the specified duration of a training program;

(4) The potential exists for the use of a variety of teaching strategies identified as promising in the review -- such as non-didactic and "hands-on" methods, small group discussion, role-play, and shared leadership of the learning process. In addition, a variety of materials to implement these strategies is provided -- such as videotapes for each section, and excerpts in print and graphic form of nationally developed resource materials;

(5) The curriculum contains companion documents for use by teacher/advisors, which are content-coordinated and present the potential for the implementation of training for trainers, including guidelines for accommodating trainees' backgrounds and cultures;

(6) This curriculum utilizes a competency structure, and reflects a consensus of the child care field. It has been field-tested and is reflective of the competency orientation of many current job training initiatives, making it a compatible component of this intervention;

(7) The curriculum appears to be amenable to the standardization required by the anticipated research design.

IV. PARENTING CURRICULA REVIEW (YEAR II)

We reviewed numerous parenting curricula, many of which were developed very recently. Given the national education goals and the burgeoning commitment to two-generation and literacy programs, parenting education curricula proliferate. The Job Corps recently developed a national parenting component and requires all Job Corps participants to enroll, and Even Start, the Department of Education's two-generation program, reports that parents are desirous of parenting education supports.

Such proliferation of parenting curricula surprised and forced us to an unanticipated level of scrutiny. The analysis of twenty selected parenting curricula (see Appendix B), though using the same and general criteria as the review of training curricula, was more complicated because the parenting curricula are much more diverse in approach, length, and philosophical base. Further, because so many

are new, there was less evaluation and less experience to undergird the analysis. Nonetheless, the findings are revealing.

Findings

From this review, we deduced the following regarding the five criteria.

Entry Gate. Entry into parenting programs can perhaps best be described as a "wide open-gate." Few specific age or literacy requirements exist, and thus there are few barriers to participation. Indeed, in contrast to training materials, parenting materials have been adapted for many skill levels and in various languages.

Content. Very few curricula reviewed spend much time on basic principles of child development. This may be attributed to the fact that many parenting curricula focus on the attainment of specific skills rather than knowledge. Concerned with improving direct management of child behavior, the curricula are often predicated not on a positive model of child development expectations but on negative models of modifying misbehavior. Many curricula reviewed attempt to assist parents to analyze their own childhood experiences. Few, however, successfully bring together knowledge and appreciation of human development with the parent's own personal experiences. Few address the special needs of single parents.

Duration. Echoing the diversity of approach and content noted above, our review indicated wide variation in the duration of the curricula, with some lasting from three to five sessions of one hour each, while others consisted of twenty sessions of three hours.

Teaching Strategies. By far, the most prevalent format in parenting curricula is direct instruction coupled with group discussion of the material presented. Based on the didactic materials that this approach requires, teaching strategies are often limited to presentation of the materials by a leader, or video segment, encouragement by the leader to elicit group reaction, and use of group reaction by the leader. Often, it is expected that such discussion will lead to general agreement on the topic being addressed.

Teaching materials are sometimes supplemented by written and graphic materials for group and individual use, role-play exercises, self-evaluation sheets for

participants, and individual and group use of videotapes. In addition to these popular formats, some curricula utilize direct experience of the parent participants and the parents' knowledge and leadership skills to implement group activities and discussions. Some use a self-instructional, self-evaluation curriculum model for individualized study, often pairing the parent with a parenting mentor. Despite these elements of flexibility, and similar to the training curricula, few parenting curricula provide specific guidelines for accommodating different trainee cultures and backgrounds.

Training of Trainers. Because parenting programs are sponsored by a variety of institutions such as schools, churches, libraries, social agencies or clubs, and housing authorities, the background for training of trainers is equally varied, representing a majority of the helping professions such as education, health, social work, psychology, religion and counseling. Accordingly, there was little evidence of in-depth training of trainers based on their background or on curriculum content. Evidence suggests that prevailing practice focuses on superficial, generalized training of trainers, permitting minimally qualified individuals to conduct training.

It should be noted that there are parenting curricula that require trainers to attend specific training sessions, that authorize them as leaders qualified to offer the program, and that place these individuals in a registry system. However, these represent a minority of the curricula reviewed.

Recommendations

Based on this review, our recommended selection is the *Parent Time Curriculum Guide*, developed by the Family Resource Coalition (Cramer, 1991). Characterized by flexibility in the use and arrangement of material, by a comprehensive approach to the multiple roles parents play, and by a range of teaching strategies reflecting adult learning theory (nondidactic, use of self-assessments and small group activities), the *Parent Time* program is the existing program that best meets our established criteria and practical considerations. In addition, the *Family Living* series (Katz et al., 1989) contains additional materials which may be used to augment the *Parent Time* curriculum.

V. JOB READINESS CURRICULA REVIEW (YEAR II)

Recognizing that instruction in the skills of a trade does not of itself provide individuals with the skills needed to prepare resumes, locate job openings, sell themselves to interviewers, and keep a job through appropriate workplace behavior, many job training efforts incorporate some degree of job readiness training in their programs. In addition, life skills -- including home budgeting, accessing community resources, and building self-esteem -- may also be addressed with the goal of promoting self-sufficiency. Such training is especially critical for those with little or no past employment experience, a characteristic likely to apply to this program's target population. Given these realities, we conducted a review of job readiness curricula for inclusion in the program.

Unlike the training and parenting curricula reviewed, few job readiness curricula are prepackaged, stand-alone entities, ready to be replicated. Often, job readiness programs rely heavily on the prior knowledge of instructors, draw from a variety of informal sources (books, articles, guest speakers from the area), vary greatly in the scope of issues addressed (e.g., assertiveness, dressing well on a budget, informational interviewing), and have not been developed into a prescribed format or schedule. Though disappointing from the standpoint of identifying replicable curricula to review, these characteristics of the field may be traceable to a strong sense of context-dependency for such programs. Flexibility in the issues to be addressed and the manner in which they are presented is cited by many practitioners we contacted in the field as a positive quality, in that it allows for variety in the specific needs and experiential backgrounds of trainees, as well as allowing programs to take advantage of local resources that may specialize in specific topics, thereby minimizing duplication of service.

Despite a predominance of locally-packaged, multi-source job readiness programs, some prepackaged, replicable curricula do exist. We reviewed seven curricula, including both prepackaged programs and a handful of the more complete and integrated locally-developed models (see Appendix C). We reviewed the curricula against the same criteria that were used with the training and parenting curricula.

Findings

Our review of job readiness curricula produced the following findings.

Entry Gate. Given the influence of participants' past employment/job search experience in determining which issues need to be covered and how, job readiness curricula are often targeted to specific groups that have similar experiential backgrounds -- welfare recipients, youth and young adults, displaced homemakers, etc. Curricula addressing the different groups may vary in their assumptions of trainees' knowledge, employment history, and future goals. Though few have explicit entry requirements, these assumptions may mitigate a curriculum's effectiveness with a nontargeted group.

Content. Curricula vary greatly in their comprehensiveness of approach, with some addressing only the practical basics of completing job applications and interviewing skills. Others focus on more long-range benefits than simple job placement, and address a wider array of factors impacting employability, including time management, budgeting income and expenses, personal appearance, methods of networking, and so forth. Echoing the competency-based approach, some advances have been made in structuring curricula around specific job readiness competencies.

Duration. Reflecting the variation in the comprehensiveness of content, the duration of the reviewed curricula ranged from fifteen hours to 140 hours, with the shorter addressing only the practical basics of job applications, resumes, interviewing, and the like.

Teaching Strategies. Perhaps the greatest shortcoming of job readiness curricula as a whole is the general tendency toward didactic approaches in the presentation of the material. Focusing on pencil-and-paper exercises and lecture formats, curricula seldom depart from a controlled leadership role for the instructor. Some programs include the use of subgroup activities and role-playing, and a handful have developed videotapes to accompany the materials. However, few provide flexibility for accommodating individual learning styles and cultural backgrounds.

Training of Trainers. An extremely wide range was found in the degree to which curricula provide training for instructors, ranging from none to extensive training and certification programs. As a rule, locally-packaged curricula contain no

such provisions, and in many cases they even fail to provide a detailed outline for presenting the materials found in the curriculum. On the other hand, curricula developed for replication may include a prefatory section for training trainers, or more extensively, training institutes, workshops, or a set program for certification may be offered (or required) by the curriculum's organization.

Recommendations

Given the relative paucity of replicable job readiness curricula appropriate for this program's target population, we selected the prepackaged curriculum that best meets our established criteria and practical considerations: the *Job Readiness Curriculum* developed by WAVE, Incorporated (WAVE, 1991). This curriculum takes a comprehensive approach to job readiness, including the coverage of life skills, and allows for flexibility in the use of its materials depending on the needs of the population. In addition, we decided to supplement this curriculum with excerpts from two other curricula. First, the *Parent Time* curriculum, selected for the parenting component, contains some appropriate sessions relevant to job readiness. Second, the *Adult Career Counseling Manual* (Shapiro, Anderson, Eisinger, Napper, Nocca, & Schulman, 1989), developed under the New York State Department of Education Division of Adult and Community Education Programs, contains some materials which may be used to supplement the WAVE program.

VI. SURVEY OF CHILD CARE TRAINING PROGRAMS (YEAR II)

The Year I review of the literature was instructive in gaining a theoretical understanding of key principles and systems for training low-income women. But these learnings needed to be mapped against real-world, functional approaches for training low-income women, particularly given that we are proposing to inaugurate an inventive training/parenting approach.

Consequently, in Year II we also identified and undertook an analysis of nine recent or currently operating child care training programs for low-income individuals across the nation (see Appendix D). Based on findings in the literature review, we developed five criteria (different from those above) related to service delivery issues: program structure and goals; population and intake; staffing; outcomes; and support services. A telephone interview protocol gathering information in these areas was

developed and conducted with staff at the nine programs, and from this information promising strategies and specific trends across sites were identified.

Findings

The telephone survey revealed the following practice-based findings regarding the delivery of child care training services.

Structure and Goals. The programs reviewed tend to focus on training for employment *either* in centers *or* in family day care, although a small number touch on issues in both fields. The durations of program interventions range from 16 1/2 hours to 840 hours, with family day care programs tending toward the lower end of the scale, and most center-focused programs falling between 200 and 450 hours. Training is conducted in a wide range of settings (YWCAs, community based organizations, job training centers, child care centers, colleges), and cohorts range from 5 to 42 trainees, with the average being 17. A few award college credit for completion of the program (the number of credits is usually in accordance with state provider qualification regulations). Only one awards the CDA credential, though others have based their training curricula on the CDA competencies.

All center-focused programs (and one in family day care) include both classroom training and supervised field-based experience (unpaid) in local centers. These two components are run concurrently, with the field work contoured to reinforce classroom-based learning. Though parenting skills are rarely included as a specific component, it is interesting to note that in most cases staff reported a carry-over effect of child care training on the trainees' perceptions of their own parenting abilities: trainees generally tend to reconsider their own parenting methods in light of their new knowledge of child development and behavior. Though surmised anecdotally, this effect has not been proven empirically. Finally, job readiness training is frequently included in the programs, but is considered a separate, add-on component to child care training, and is generally conceived narrowly as basic job placement services.

Population and Intake. The majority of programs are directed at low-income individuals with a high school diploma or GED. Though they are usually intended for trainees with no previous child care experience, some programs also admit those currently employed in child care (e.g., substitutes, part-time workers, or those wishing

to earn the CDA credential). In addition, most programs have no gender restrictions on eligibility, though very few were found to have male trainees enrolled.

In addition to the above income and education requirements, additional processes are often used to ensure an appropriate match between the applicant and the intervention. Two methods were noted in the survey: orientation, and attitude assessment. First, thorough orientation periods of as much as two weeks ensure that applicants have a clear understanding of the training program and the child care field, and can make an educated and considered decision to enter the program. Second, interviews and observed applicant participation in prescribed activities (child care-related role playing, individual and group problem-solving, reading out loud, etc.) can provide staff with insight into applicants' values, motivations, basic skill levels, and commitment both to training and to a child care career. Requiring a large pool of applicants to be effective, however, such screening may be hindered by a limited number of referral sources, by sources insufficiently informed as to the requirements of the program, by rural location, and by scheduling restrictions.

Staffing. The staffing patterns of the programs surveyed often include multiple role assignments for staff members. Such role overlap -- wherein classroom teachers might also serve as field supervisors, counselors, or case managers, for example -- provides trainees with a comforting sense of program cohesiveness, and permit staff to work more in concert to address the needs of trainees. Another staffing characteristic cited as being linked to the successful delivery of services is the existence of a shared philosophy regarding low-income individuals. When staff members are not fragmented by biases or prejudice and share an understanding of trainees' various barriers to self-sufficiency, they are better able to discuss and collaborate to implement solutions to these barriers.

Trainers possess a wide range of qualifications across programs, ranging from former child care providers to college professors. Perhaps the most common qualification is a college degree in child development or early education.

Outcomes. Higher rates of program completion (75-95%) were often cited as being linked to the program's ability to screen large numbers of applicants (which in turn is dependent on the existence of a large pool of applicants). Successful job placement rates (80-100%) were often seen as a result of awarding college credit

and/or the CDA credential, which were thought to strongly improve graduates' employability.

Assessing the local market's need for trained child care workers has proven a successful method of predicting a program's placement rate in a given community and may also help to contour the program to market conditions. Used by a small number of the programs surveyed, such evaluations gather information on local centers' present and future hiring plans, thereby determining graduates' chances for employment. In addition, the relationships established with local child care centers through the assessment process have been helpful in locating specific job openings for graduates. In one program surveyed, employment opportunities have been further ensured by polling centers on the qualifications they desired in a new employee and incorporating their needs into the training curriculum.

Support Services. Echoing the findings of the literature review, the survey reinforced the fact that low-income women often face numerous barriers to employment, and generally require numerous supports to make the transition to self-sufficiency. The majority of programs provide child care assistance (on-site, voucher system, or reimbursement), transportation assistance (van service, bus pass, or reimbursement), personal and/or group counseling, peer support groups, and case management. An additional support that may be necessary if college-level texts are used is a tutorial service provided either by peers in the program or by staff.

Recommendations

Analysis of these findings identified the following recommendations for the proposed intervention.

Structure and Goals. Evidence collected from both the field survey and the literature suggests that we direct our intervention toward center-based employment, with a limited focus on family day care as a possible option for graduates. In our Year I work, the stated goals of our program included the training of quality child care providers, with such employment seen as an exit from poverty and a potential stepping stone to higher positions and/or related fields. Successful family day care training, however, requires a substantial focus on business issues, necessarily reducing the time available to teach quality child care skills. In addition, low-income women often face profound practical challenges in starting their own family day care

homes, such as expensive housing improvements required to meet licensing regulations, liability insurance costs, limited access to benefit packages, and isolation from other adults. Also, the literature indicates that family day care often does not raise women out of poverty (Breidenbach, 1988), and career advancement to higher positions and other fields may be more difficult than from center-based employment, where employees enjoy the ongoing support and guidance of their supervisors. Finally, research argues that family day care is appropriate for only a small portion of the population: those with interests and basic abilities in *both* child care and entrepreneurialism (Carstensen, 1986). By training for center-based employment, and providing family day care as an option, we would be able to fulfill our project's goals while not forcibly ruling out employment options for trainees.

Although the literature review indicated an increasing need for infant and toddler care, we are hesitant to focus our training specifically on the care and education of this age group for several reasons. First, although the need for infant and toddler care is presently abundant, due to the expense of its provision it may not be matched by a proliferation of center-based services. Consequently, need for care may not necessarily translate into an equivalent need for providers. Second, center-based child care for children aged 0-2 constitutes only 16% of the center-based market (Willer et al., 1991), suggesting that focusing training for this age group may delimit employment opportunities and options for graduates in the future. Finally, some of our advisors suggest that infant and toddler care, more so than preschool care, is not for everyone; it takes special desires, skills, and talents. Consequently, limiting training here may excise some participants who are competent to provide child care generally, but not with this age group. Infant and toddler care should not be totally excluded from the program, however. Rather, we should augment a primarily preschool-focused program with some coverage of infant and toddler care, thereby providing trainees with a broader knowledge base of child development and raising it as an option for later pursuit.

Based on the survey findings, our training program should include concurrent and integrated classroom training and field experience components. Given the tendency of child care training to trigger applicants' interest in their own parenting, a parenting component would be most effective when integrated with the child care training. An expanded approach to job readiness training should also be included, perhaps incorporating this component into the program more closely. Approximately 17 individuals should be trained per cohort, and the training may last up to 700-800

hours if sufficient support services are provided. Given the apparent effect of college credit and the CDA credential on placement rates, training for one or both of these objectives would be advisable.

Population and Intake. The findings from the survey on education eligibility criteria provide strong support for training low-income women with a high school diploma or GED. Though the question of including already employed low-income child care workers in the training was raised by the survey, the inclusion of this presently-employed population would drastically confound the program's evaluation, and is therefore not recommended. Furthermore, because differences between male and female job training experiences have been documented in the literature, we suggest that any inclusion of men in training be closely observed for any impact their inclusion may cause.

An orientation to the program and to the child care field should be provided to enable applicants to make an informed decision to enter training. However, given the experimental nature of this project, an attitude assessment would complicate the assignment of experimental and control groups, and is therefore not recommended.

In order to provide a large enough applicant pool, training should be conducted in an urban area, and referral sources should be educated regarding all of the programs' requirements to ensure appropriate referrals. In addition, the age limitation for trainees' children determined in Year I should be changed, from "women with children under five years" to "women with at least one child under five years." It is expected that this alteration will increase the eligible population without severely reducing the effect of parenting education.

Staffing. In addition to educational and experiential qualifications described in Section VIII, personal attitudes should be considered in selecting staff. Successful trainers should be chosen based upon their unbiased, "can-do" attitudes regarding low-income individuals, and their commitment to creating a shared staff philosophy of service delivery. They should be assigned multiple roles to eliminate the categorization of program components and to permit more fluent intra-program communication. Though there will be considerable overlap, staff roles will include at least the following: program coordinator, classroom instructor/facilitator (for child care, parenting, and job readiness), field experience supervisor, case manager,

personal/group counselor, community liaison (to locate field experience sites and job openings), and job search/placement advisor.

Outcomes. Recommended above, the use of an orientation period to ensure an informed trainee decision to enter training, as well as the award of college credit or the CDA credential upon program graduation, should be expected to boost program outcomes. Further, a job market analysis should be conducted to assess the local need for trained child care workers, the expected quality of jobs (wages, benefits), the potential for career advancement for graduates, and other predictors of success. As shown above, this analysis would also provide valuable ties to local centers and allow the training to be contoured to meet local market needs. These ties should be nurtured throughout the course of the program.

Support Services. In order not to exclude those applicants who are otherwise eligible, child care and transportation assistance should be provided. Transportation may be provided directly or through reimbursement or monthly passes, depending on local conditions. The job readiness component of training should be augmented by direct assistance in locating and interviewing for employment openings. Case management and support groups should also be included in the program. In addition, other services, such as health care, transitional supports (after graduation), English as a Second Language, and basic skills tutoring, should be available depending on need and/or our sources of funding.

VII. ORGANIZATIONAL HOME AND RESEARCH DESIGN (YEAR II)

Concurrent with the above efforts to develop an effective intervention and in anticipation of a Year III piloting of the program, a portion of Year II was devoted to identifying a suitable organizational home in which to lodge the intervention, as well as to the development of a sound research design to evaluate its effectiveness.

Prompted by a June 11, 1992 request for proposal announcement in the Federal Register by the Department of Health and Human Services for Head Start-University research collaborations, we began investigating the possibility of lodging our program in the New Haven Public Schools Head Start Program. Having already contacted the program earlier in the year for review of our evolving implementation plan, we felt

that Head Start might serve as a particularly appropriate locus for our program. With a similar client population (low-income mothers) and an inherent environment of concern for quality in early childhood education and comprehensive services for children and families, the Head Start program bears numerous philosophical and practical similarities to Family Education and Training. Indeed, it was felt that uniting job training, parenting, and child care in such an environment could prove beneficial to both programs.

An agreement to collaborate was reached with the Head Start program, and work was begun to develop the research design that would be submitted for funding to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children, Youth and Families (ACYF). This research design, structured around the stipulated three-year funding period (serendipitously paralleling the expected Family Education and Training implementation timeline), was designed to measure a range of expected program outcomes, including increased employability of trainees, improved parenting skills, improved self-esteem of trainees, and increased cognitive and social competence in trainees' children. The proposal was selected for funding, beginning in October of 1992, thereby enabling the evaluation of the intervention and making available limited implementation dollars to enable a piloting of the program.

VIII. OUTLINE OF THE PROPOSED INTERVENTION (YEAR II)

Based on the findings and recommendations from the Year I literature review, the Year II reviews of curricula and training programs, and the lodging of training within Head Start, we developed the following outline for the training intervention.

Credentialling Approach

Findings from the review of delivery systems reveal distinct benefits of training for a recognized credential or ability level. Both college credit and the CDA credential were cited as valuable end-products of training, increasing both graduates' employability and their eligibility for non-entry level positions.

Based on our research, we feel that the CDA credential is the most appropriate end-product for our training intervention. Echoing our findings from years I and II, the CDA possesses the flexibility to accommodate individual learning styles and

allows candidates to proceed at their own rate. It respects trainees' backgrounds (there is a bilingual, English/Spanish endorsement available), incorporates concurrent practical and theoretical experiences, and is competency-based. In addition, the multi-dimensional assessment process used to award the credential allows for variety in the ways trainees are best able to demonstrate their competencies. Possession of the credential earns graduates up to nine academic credits from Connecticut community colleges (policies for awarding credit have also been established in other states), thereby providing an incentive to continue educational preparation for upward mobility in the field. Further, although we plan to train for the center-based, preschool assessment, the opportunity exists for later assessments in infant and toddler care, family day care, and bilingual child care settings. Perhaps most important is the potential the CDA competency structure presents for nesting identical or related parenting and job readiness competencies, providing a more integrated approach to training (see below).

In addition to encompassing many of our research findings, further investigation revealed an even stronger argument for the CDA system. The CDA training and assessment vehicle has been piloted, field tested, and reshaped over a period of twenty years. It is built into the day care center licensing requirements for director and teacher positions in 49 states, thereby allowing people with this credential entry into child care employment substantially above "entry-level." In addition, the transferability potential across states, and the fact that it represents consensus of professional organizations and the state and national government structures dealing with child care, make it a virtual "union card" for people entering the field. The credential is awarded for three years, with renewals possible for subsequent five-year periods. It has broad-based applicability to a variety of child care settings. In sum, the CDA allows for the immediate and satisfactory utilization of the training experience.

The CDA Direct Assessment method of credentialling, as revised in June of 1992, fits neatly into the recommended structure of our intervention. The revised system will require a total of 600 hours of child care training and experience: 120 hours of formal training (classroom training); and 480 hours of experience working directly with children. Such a program leaves sufficient time within the 700-800 hour maximum time frame for the additional components of parenting and job readiness.

During the course of the program, candidates are assisted in accumulating information and evidence of their competence as skilled caregivers. The decision to issue a CDA credential is made after weighing the following evidence of the candidate's competence:

(1) a professional resource file, which is a collection of reference materials that serve as a working resource to be used on a daily basis on the job;

(2) parent opinion questionnaires, which are distributed to parents of children with whom the candidate works, covering a wide range of caregiver behaviors, and 75% of which must be returned and reviewed;

(3) evidence of the candidate's skill in practice as evaluated by an early childhood professional using the CDA Assessment Observation Instrument to rate the candidate's performance;

(4) further evidence of competence, provided in a structured oral interview conducted by a CDA representative designated by the Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition, during which the candidate has an opportunity to describe how knowledge of good early childhood practice would be applied in a variety of early childhood settings; and

(5) results from a multiple choice examination, administered to candidates in small groups by a Council CDA representative.

Selection and Integration of Curricula

The program will use the *Essentials* training curriculum and materials, the *Parent Time Curriculum Guide* (supplemented by the *Family Living* series), and the WAVE *Job Readiness Curriculum* (supplemented by *Parent Time* and the *Adult Career Counseling Manual*). As noted above, these curricula were found to be the most appropriate within each of the three domains for the intervention's intended audience. The *Essentials* curriculum is also geared directly toward the achievement of the CDA credential. Finally, both *Essentials* and *Parent Time* cover child development from birth through age 5, further facilitating CDA cross-endorsement for infants and toddlers and providing a wider base of knowledge for parents.

Aside from *Parent Time*'s partial focus on employment issues, however, none of the curricula we reviewed or selected make an attempt to incorporate a holistic approach to moving low-income women toward self-sufficiency. Instead, each

focuses on a circumscribed field of learning (child care, *or* parenting, *or* job readiness, etc.). Similarly, most of the training programs that we reviewed, and that provide more than just child care skill training, do so without creating conceptual linkages among the domains, and none unite child care training, parenting, and job readiness together. Such a categorical approach to meeting the multiple needs of trainees and their families fragments training both by population (child or adult) and by service outcome (increased income; greater employability; improved parenting; improved cognitive and social competence in children). *Departing from this piecemeal approach to effecting comprehensive change, this project focuses on not only including but drawing together these three domains, thereby capitalizing on similarities in content across the fields and developing a thematically integrated curriculum to address the larger, more comprehensive objective of moving families toward self-sufficiency.*

The competency-based structure of the CDA process and the *Essentials* curriculum provided a basis for integrating the three domains. This structure is framed by six competencies, the mastery of which qualifies participants for receipt of the CDA credential. Close examination of these competencies reveals that they not only form the infrastructure for the *Essentials* curriculum, but that they are also applicable to the domains of parenting and job readiness. For example, the fourth CDA competency -- establishing positive and productive relationships with families -- can be applied to the other two domains by substituting "relationships with neighbors and the community" (parenting) or "linkages with employers and the world of work" (job readiness).

Building on the competencies delineated in the *Essentials* child care training curriculum, six "partner" competencies were developed for each of the other two domains, resulting in parallel competencies across the three domains of the curriculum. The linked competencies thereby created a unified backbone around which the activities and the content of the integrated curriculum was developed.

By aligning the three curricular domains in this manner, the resultant curriculum should constitute a more holistic and effective approach to family education and training, facilitating the reinforcement of content among domains. It is expected that this approach will both require and allow for greater communication and cooperation among staff, cited in the literature as a positive element. With potential benefit for the field, the success of such a comprehensive curricular approach may serve to

influence the future development of education and training curricula. Finally, the competency-based, thematic integration of these domains may help foster in participants an understanding of the generalizability of skills.

Duration

The total duration of the intervention is expected to be 720 hours, over 36 weeks (not including vacations), 20 hours per week, four hours per day (paralleling the annual, weekly, and daily schedules of Head Start). All components of the program, including classroom training and field experience, will take place at a multi-classroom Head Start center. The 720 hours will be divided as follows: 180 hours will be devoted to formal, classroom-based training, including child care training (120 hours), parenting education and support (32 hours), and job readiness training and job search activity (54 hours). In the field experience component, each trainee will spend 496 hours working with children, focusing on issues and activities specified by the *Essentials* curriculum. The final 18 hours will be devoted to biweekly, trainee-directed support group meetings (described below under Support Services). The intervention will also adhere to the schedule of the local public schools to minimize trainees' needs for additional child care.

Staff and Cohort Size

Program staff positions will likely include two part-time CDA Teacher/Advisors, and one part-time Program Coordinator (see below for job descriptions). Based on ten students per CDA Teacher/Advisor, which we feel is an appropriate maximum, the program cohort size will be 20. Though the average of reviewed training programs was 17, we feel that training 20 individuals will not limit the effectiveness of the program.

Trainees

Those eligible for the program are Head Start parents 18 years of age or older who have completed a high school diploma or GED and are on public assistance or below income according to Head Start guidelines. In order to minimize confounding variables, trainees may not have previously been trained as a child care worker, or been employed in child care beyond a temporary or minimal involvement. Given the demographics of the Head Start population, eligibility will be expanded from Year

I recommendations to include individuals who are legal guardians of children in Head Start. Further, males will be eligible, and the impact of their inclusion will be closely monitored.

Both to reduce "creaming" of only the most qualified trainees and to allow for random assignment in the program's research design, an attitudinal screen of applicants will not be conducted, although a brief orientation to both the program and the field of child care, followed by an a simple assessment of interest in participating in such a program, will be conducted with all Head Start parents.

Support Services

Group support meetings will provide a forum for peer group support, enabling trainees to share experiences, problems, and solutions with one another. These sessions will be directed by trainees, with facilitation and suggestion of discussion topics provided as needed by a program staff member. In addition, in light of recommendations made by our advisors, support group meetings will also occasionally serve as forums for trainees and staff to meet as an advisory group on the operation and progress of the program. Issues may include support services; unforeseen barriers to program attendance or completion of work; interest in focusing on, or need for reiteration of, specific curriculum areas; and staff-trainee relations. Decisions on program alterations will be made by staff and trainees together, and action plans will be developed.

If found to be both feasible and beneficial, following program completion graduates will be assisted in developing the support group into a permanent and self-supporting entity. Meetings would then serve as a clearinghouse for information on job openings, as a source of social and emotional peer support for graduates and their families as they move toward self-sufficiency, and as an ongoing support system to help relieve the pressures associated with working and parenting simultaneously, and with employment in the child care field. Finally, graduates of successive cohorts could benefit from the knowledge and experience of prior graduates.

Because the program will take place during Head Start and public school operating hours, child care will automatically be provided for trainees' Head Start-enrolled children, and older children will be in school. Investigations are being made into child care for trainees' younger children. Transportation will be provided to

trainees, most likely in the form of monthly bus passes. Transitional transportation and child care services may be extended up to one year after graduation, depending on funding source. If possible, tutoring services will be provided to those in need. For needs that the program cannot meet, trainees will be referred to other services in Head Start or elsewhere in the community.

Annual Program Timeline

Below is the annual program timeline for cohorts I and II in program years IV and V. The timeline for the piloting of the intervention, in year III, will be somewhat compressed, and will not include the full extent of the curricular plan.

SEPTEMBER: Recruitment and orientation of interested candidates. Development of lesson plans. Final cohort of 25 is selected. Trainees' needs for support services are assessed and services are arranged.

SEPTEMBER-MAY: Training begins. Job search assistance and placement activities begin in February. Trainees apply for CDA assessment by March 1.

MAY: Trainees are formally assessed for the CDA credential and graduate. Job placement continues as needed.

JUNE-JULY: Follow-up, additional placement assistance. Support group becomes self-perpetuating and independent of program.

Staff Job Descriptions

Teacher/Advisors: Reflecting CDA guidelines, candidates for the two full-time Teacher/Advisor positions should have a B.A. or B.S. in early childhood or child development (including 12 semester hours on children ages 0-5), and two years experience in child care (one year working with children directly, and one year with managerial responsibilities). Experience in CDA training and/or field experience supervision would also be preferred. Finally, as with all staff positions, preference will be given to those with experience working with, or an appreciation for the problems facing, low-income populations, and to those with confidence and enthusiasm regarding the this population's ability to succeed.

Responsibilities include conducting formal training, overseeing, supporting, and evaluating their assigned trainees (10 per Teacher/Advisor) in field experiences (at least one site observation per trainee each month, with additional opportunities to discuss field experiences during class and support group), and assisting trainees through their completion of the CDA certificate. They will alternate with each other co-facilitating biweekly support group meetings with the Program Coordinator.

Program Coordinator: The Program Coordinator will ideally contribute a non-child care, low-income/welfare/job training perspective to balance the backgrounds of the Teacher/Advisors. Priority should be given to candidates with experience in the administration of job training programs (for low-income populations). The position's responsibilities include administration, planning, staff coordination and team leadership, assisting in program evaluation, implementing recruitment and orientation, conducting case management for participants, providing job readiness training and conducting placement assistance, and serving, along with the Teacher/Advisors, as the co-facilitator of group support meetings. At the end of training, the Coordinator will conduct follow-up and continued placement assistance, assist in collecting program evaluation data, and help establish the support group as a self-supporting entity.

* * *

Incorporating an extensive review and selection of curricula, a field-based investigation into the experiences of similar training programs, the successful identification of an organizational home, and the design of and acquisition of funding for a thorough program evaluation, Year II efforts have successfully bridged the gap between the academic analysis of the Year I literature review and the practical implementation of the intervention. We feel that the implementation plan resulting from these efforts, together with the integrated curriculum and research design documents, constitutes a potent and promising program design, ready for piloting, and with potential benefits for its low-income participants, their families, and the research and family services communities at large.

REFERENCES

Bane, M. J., & Ellwood, D. T. (1983). The dynamics of dependence: Routes to self-sufficiency. Cambridge, MA: Urban Systems Research.

Bane, M. J., & Ellwood, D. T. (1986). Slipping into and out of poverty: The dynamics of spells. Journal of Human Resources, 21(1), 1-23.

Besharov, D. (1989). Targeting long-term welfare recipients. In P. Cunningham & D. Ellwood (Eds.), Welfare policy for the 1990s. (pp. 46-165). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Blau, D. M. (1989). The child care labor market (Working Paper No. 89-7). Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, Department of Economics.

Bredekamp, S. (1990, November). Preparation and professional development programs for early childhood educators: Adequacy of the knowledge base. Paper presented at the Carnegie/Rockefeller Brothers Conference, New York.

Breidenbach, J. (1988, March). The viability of family day care: A women's self-employment initiative. Prepared as testimony for the California State Legislative Hearing on the Changing Family.

Carstensen, C. (1986). The appropriateness of entrepreneurial training in Wisconsin's employment and training system (Employment and Training Policy Paper No. 3). Madison, WI: Wisconsin State Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations.

Copple, C. (1990). Quality matters: Improving the professional development of the early childhood workforce. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Costley, J. (1988, March 2). Professional preparation issues in early childhood. Testimony before the Early Childhood Task Force of the National Association of State Boards of Education, Boston.

Cramer, L. (1991). Parent time curriculum guide: A learning activities guide for the PACE family literacy program. Chicago, IL: Family Resource Coalition.

Cross, K. P. (1981). Adults as learners. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Duncan, G. J. (1984). Years of poverty, years of plenty. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Ellwood, D. T. (1986). Targeting "would be" long-term recipients of AFDC. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.

Ellwood, D. (1988). Poor support: Poverty in the American family. New York: Basic Books.

Freire, P. (1970). Cultural action for freedom (Monograph Series No. 1). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Grossman J. B., Maynard, R., & Roberts, J. (1985). Reanalysis of the effects of selected employment and training programs for welfare recipients (Contract No. 100-84-0059). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Gueron, J. (1989). Work programs for welfare recipients. In S. L. Harlan and R. J. Steinberg (Eds.), Job training for women: The promise and limits of public policies (pp. 365-388). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hollister, R., Kemper, P., & Maynard, R. (1984). The national supported work demonstration. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Howes, C. (1990, November). Preparation and professional development programs for early childhood educators: Emerging needs for the next decade. Paper presented at the Carnegie/Rockefeller Brothers Conference, New York.

Kagan, S. L., Costley, J., Landesman, L., Marx, F., Neville, P., Parker, S., & Rustici, J. (1992). Family education and training: Obstacles, opportunities, and outcomes for low-income mothers (CFCSCL Report No. 4). New Haven: Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning.

Katz, L. G., et al. (1989). Family living: Suggestions for effective parenting. Urbana, IL: ERIC (Catalog 105).

Kisker, E., Hofferth, S., & Phillips, D. (1991). A profile of child care settings: Early education and care in 1990. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.

Knowles, M. (1980). The modern practice of adult education (rev. ed.). Chicago: Association Press/Follett.

Knox, A. B. (1980). Proficiency theory of adult learning. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 5(3), 378-404.

Lasker, H. M., & Moore, J. F. (1980). Current studies in adult development. In H. M. Lasker, J. F. Moore, & E. Simpson (Eds.), Adult development & approaches to learning (p. 35). Washington, DC: National Institute for Community Development.

Lowenthal, M., Thurnher, M., & Chiriboga, D. (1975). Four stages of life. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Maxfield, M., Jr. (1990). Planning employment services for the disadvantaged. New York: Rockefeller Foundation.

Mezirow, J. (1981). A critical theory of adult learning and education. Adult Education, 32(1), 3-27.

O'Neill, J., Wolf, D. A., Bassi, L. J., & Hannan, M. T. (1984). An analysis of time on welfare (Contract No. HHS-100-83-0048). Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Ooms, T., & Owen, T. (1991, March). Teenage mothers and the family support act: What works -- "carrots" or "sticks." In Meeting highlights and background briefing report. Family Impact Seminar, Washington, DC.

Peters, D. (1988, November). Current issues and future needs in staff training. Paper presented at the National Policy Conference on Early Childhood Issues, Washington, DC.

Phillips, C. B., (Ed.). (1991). Essentials for Child Development Associates working with young children. Council for early Childhood Professional Recognition.

Rockefeller Brothers Fund. (1990). A quest for coherence in the training of early care and education teachers. New York: Author.

Ruggles, P. (1988). Short term fluctuations in income and their relationships to the characteristics of the low income population: New data from SIPP (Survey of Income and Program
Participation Working Paper No. 8802). Washington,f DC: Bureau of the Census.

Ruggles, P. (1989). Welfare dependency and its causes: Determinants of the duration of welfare spells (Survey of Income and Program Participation Working Paper No. 8908). Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census.

Ruopp, R., Travers, J., Glantz, F., & Coelen, C. (1979). Children at the center: Summary findings and policy implications of the National Day Care Study. Cambridge, MA: Abt.

Shapiro, S., Anderson, M. T., Eisinger, G., Napper, J. A., Nocca, B., & Schulman, J. (1989). Administering and implementing adult career counseling services in comprehensive public adult and continuing education programs in New York State: A manual for administrators and counselors. Albany: New York State Education Department, Division of Adult and Continuing Education Programs.

Sheehy, G. (1976). Passages: Predictable crises in adult life. New York: E. P. Dutton.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (1979). Women: Still in poverty (Report No. 60). Washington, DC: Clearinghouse Publications.

U.S. General Accounting Office. (1989a). Job Training Partnership Act: Informati on on training, placements, and wages of male and female participants (Report No. HRD-89-152FS). Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. General Accounting Office. (1989b). Job Training Partnership Act: Services and outcomes for participants with differing needs (Report No. HRD-89-52). Washington, DC: Author.

WAVE, Inc. (1991). Job readiness curriculum. Washington, DC: Author.

Willer, B., Hofferth, S., Kisker, E., Divine-Hawkins, P., Farquhar, E., & Glantz, F. (1991). The demand and supply of child care in 1990: Joint findings from the National Child Care Survey 1990 and a Profile of Child Care Settings. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Zemke, R., & Zemke, S. (1981, June). 30 things we know for sure about adult learning. Training: The Magazine of Human Resources Development, pp. 1-4.

Zill, N., Moore, K. A., Nord, C. W., & Stief, T. (1991). Welfare mothers as potential employees: A statistical profile based on national survey data. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

APPENDIX A

Child care training curricula reviewed:

Adcock, D., & Segal, M. (1983). Play together, grow together: A cooperative curriculum for teachers of young children. Mailman Family Press.

Agency for Instructional Technology, Madison Education Extension Programs, School of Education, Wisconsin University. (1989). Caring for children: An introduction to child care. Madison: Author.

Beaty, J. [Curriculum consists of three documents:]

(1992). Skills for preschool teachers. New York: Macmillan.

(1990). Observing development of the young child. New York: Macmillan.

(1992). Pre/school appropriate practices. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Child Development Division, California Department of Education. (1991). The program for infant/toddler caregivers: A comprehensive video training system for caregivers. California Department of Education and the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Sausalito, CA.

Day, D. E. (1983). Early childhood education: A human ecological approach. Scott Foresman Series in Education.

Dodge, D. T. [Curriculum consists of two documents:]

(1990). A trainer's guide to caring for preschool children. Teaching Strategies, Inc.

Dodge, D. T., Koralek, D. G., & Pizzolongo, P. J. (1989). Caring for preschool children. Teaching Strategies, Inc.

Dodge, D. T. [Curriculum consists of two documents:]

Dodge, D. T., Dombro, A. L., & Koralek, D. G. (1990). Caring for infants and toddlers: Volumes I & II. Teaching Strategies, Inc.

Dodge, D. T., & Koralek, D. G. (1991). A trainer's guide to caring for infants and toddlers. Teaching Strategies, Inc.

Draper, M. W., & Draper, H. E. (1979). Caring for children [Glencoe Career Book]. Mission Hills, CA: Glencoe/McGraw Hill.

Hendrick, J. (1992). The whole child: Developmental education for the early years. New York: Macmillan.

Herr, J., & Zimmerman, K. (1991). Assistant child care teacher: A teacher's guide. Madison: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

Hildebrand, Verna. (1991). Introduction to Early Childhood Education. New York: MacMillan.

Hohmann, M., Barnet, B., & Weikart, D. P. (1979). Young children in action. High/Scope Press.

Hohmann, M. (1983). Study guide to young children in action. High/Scope Press.

Honeycutt, M., & Foster, C. L. (1981). Arizona/Nevada child development associates training program (Arizona/Nevada HSST/CDA). Coolidge: Central Arizona College.

Kasindorf, M. E. (1979). Competencies: A self-study guide to teaching competencies in early childhood education. Humanics Limited.

Kerwin, S. (1989). Early childhood career opportunities (ECCO). Oakton, IL: Oakton Community College.

Louisiana Technical University. (1986). Child care curriculum guide. Ruston College of Home Economics.

Machado, J. M., & Meyers, H. C. (1984). Early childhood practicum guide. Delmar Publishers.

Nova University. (1991). All about child care (Text, trainee's manual, instructor's guide). Author.

Phillips, C. B., (Ed.). (1991). Essentials for Child Development Associates working with young children. Council for early Childhood Professional Recognition.

Schneider, J., et al. (1989). CAPE child care training. Dallas, TX: Childcare Alternatives and Parent Education.

Spodek, B., Saracho, O., & Davis, H. (1987). Foundations of early childhood education: Teaching three, four, and five-year-old children. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

APPENDIX B

Parenting curricula reviewed:

American Guidance Service. (1991). Everyday Matters. Circle Pines, NM: Author.

Children's Television Network. (1989). Raising kids who love to learn (Family Living Series). Prentice Hall Press.

Cordisco, L. K., & Mazer, C. (1981). The LEAP parent training curriculum: Learning experiences -- An alternative for preschoolers and their parents. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Cramer, L. (1991). Parent time curriculum guide: A learning activities guide for the PACE family literacy program. Chicago, IL: Family Resource Coalition.

Dau, Walker & Associates. (1990). Job Corps parenting education curriculum. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.

Dinkmeyer, D., McKay, G. D., & Dinkmeyer, J. S. (1989). Early childhood STEP. American Guidance Service.

Greenspan, S. (1991). Floor time: Tuning in to each child. Scholastic.

Karnes, M. B. (1979, 1981). Small wonder. American Guidance Service.

Karnes, M. B. (1982). You and your small wonder. American Guidance Service.

Katz, L. G., et al. (1989). Family living: Suggestions for effective parenting. Urbana, IL: ERIC (Catalog 105).

Popkin, M. (1987). Active parenting. St. Paul, MN: Redleaf Press.

Parents as Teachers National Center and the Clayton Child Center. (Revised, 1990). Parents as teachers in the child care setting. St. Louis: University of Missouri, St. Louis.

Rothenburg, B. A., et al. (1990). Parentmaking. St. Paul, MN: Redleaf Press.

Roy Littlejohn Associates, Inc. (1980). Exploring parenting (DHHS Publication No. (OHDS) 80-31134).

Roy Littlejohn Associates, Inc. (1980). A leader's guide to exploring parenting (DHHS Publication No. (OHDS) 80-31137).

Roy Littlejohn Associates, Inc. (1983). A manual for training leaders in exploring parenting (DHHS Publication No. (OHDS) 83-31140).

Ursa Institute. (1978). A curriculum in parenting training. Washington, DC: Office of Child Development.

U.S. Government Printing Office. (1987). Looking at life (181-285/73327).

Washburn Child Guidance Center. (1991). Everyday matters (Developed under grant from United Way of Minneapolis -- Success by Six). American Guidance Service.

Wetzel, L. (1989). Parents of young children: A parent education curriculum. St. Paul, MN: Redleaf Press.

APPENDIX C

Job readiness curricula reviewed:

Adkins, W. R., Manuele, C. A., Lovett, A. B., Davis, D. D., & Culliname, M. C. (1985). Adkins life skills program: Career development series (2nd ed.). New York: Institute for Life Coping Skills.

Bridgeport Jobs. Job readiness training. Bridgeport: Private Industry Council of Southern Connecticut (unpublished document).

Burrus, D. A. Transition to work curriculum: A training guide in life management skills and socialization to work. Boston, MA: Bay State Skills Corporation.

New Haven Private Industry Council. (1990). Pre-employment training curriculum outline. New Haven: Author (unpublished document).

Shapiro, S., Anderson, M. T., Eisinger, G., Napper, J. A., Nocca, B., & Schulman, J. (1989). Administering and implementing adult career counseling services in comprehensive public adult and continuing education programs in New York State: A manual for administrators and counselors. Albany: New York State Education Department, Division of Adult and Continuing Education Programs.

State of Connecticut, Department of Labor, Employment Security Division. Job Search and Vocational Exploration Workshops. Wethersfield, CT: Author (unpublished document).

WAVE, Inc. (1991). Job readiness curriculum. Washington, DC: Author.

APPENDIX D

Child care training projects reviewed:

Child care aide and substitute training program. Hartford College for Women, Hartford, CT.

Child care careers program. Wheelock College, Boston.

Child Care Connections family day care training program. Child Care Connections, Trenton, NJ.

Child care training program. Center for Employment Training, San Jose, CA.

Childcare training program. YWCA, New Britain, CT. (No longer in operation.)

Competent caregivers training program. The CAPE Center, Inc., Dallas, TX.

Day care aide training program. Children's Village Child Care Center, Philadelphia, PA. (No longer in operation.)

Family day care provider training program. Ohio Hunger Task Force, Columbus, OH.

Parkview Terrace child care project. Western Neighbors, Tulsa, OK.